DRAFT MEETING MINUTES

MEETING NAME: WISCONSIN ENTERPRISE ARCHITECTURE TEAM (WEAT)
DATE: FEBRUARY 24, 2004
TIME: 10:00 A.M. TO 12:00 P. M.
LOCATION: ADMINISTRATION BUILDING, CONFERENCE ROOM 8F

WEAT Members:

- Group Leader/Chief Enterprise Architect – Ben Banks (a DET representative)
- Lead Technical Enterprise Architect – George Ross (a DET representative)
- Enterprise Architect – Keith Hazelton (UW representative)
- Enterprise Architect – Bud Borja (Milwaukee Co., local government representative)
- Enterprise Architect – Jay Jaeger (DOT, large state agency representative)
- Enterprise Architect – Judy Heil (DATCP, small state agency representative)

DET Support Staff: Patricia Carlson, Monique Currie and Michelle Eldridge

Agenda Items:

(1) Enterprise Architecture Update - Ben Banks (15 Minutes)

- 90 –Day Deliverables
- Draft, WEAT Charter
- Draft, Enterprise Architecture Principles
- Draft, Enterprise Framework Diagram
- Draft, Enterprise Architecture Governance Model Diagram
- Draft, Update Enterprise Architecture Life Cycle Diagram

(2) Overview of DET Enterprise Technology Inventory – Monique Currie (15 Minutes)

(3) Overview of the Zachman Framework – George Ross (20 Minutes)

(4) Process Mapping of Phase One of the Enterprise Architecture Life Cycle – Facilitated by Michelle Eldridge (60 minutes)

(5) Wrap-up and Assignments for Next Meeting – Ben (10 minutes)

Opening Remarks from Matt Miszweski the State Chief Information Officer (CIO)

Matt Miszweski, the State CIO, addressed WEAT regarding concerns that some members of the team had voiced to him during the past week. Matt stated that he expected there would be concerns from various entities within the State, as "we are doing something that has never been done before". Matt stated that the Enterprise Architecture is not a singular event, but an ongoing process that will effect the State's approach to information technology for the next 10-20 years.

Matt stated that part of this week's Division of Enterprise Technology (DET) Senior Management Team meeting was devoted to Enterprise Architecture. Matt provided his senior managers with an article from Gartner Group, entitled "Defining 'Good Enough' Architecture".[1] Matt indicated that he felt it is important to get something "good enough" out the door in a reasonably short period of time frame with regards to an Enterprise Architecture document. Matt is open to extending the 90-day timeframe if necessary to develop a 'quality' product. He does not want to sacrifice quality for the sake of meeting a deadline.

Matt specifically addressed concerns Jay Jaeger expressed via email, specifically that there is a 'road map' for the Enterprise Architecture that has not been expressed to WEAT. Matt affirmed that there is not yet a fixed 'road map' for the Enterprise Architecture initiative.

Furthermore, Matt indicated he is committed to the State's Information Technology governance structure, but he would as, CIO, provide 'straw-men' or suggests with respect to Enterprise Architecture to initiate discussions among WEAT and the State's Information Technology governance organizations (Technology Leadership Council, Technology Domains and the Business Leadership Council).

Matt asked WEAT what the team's views on "open source" are or what had been discussed regarding "open source". The team expressed that there needed to be clarification of "open source" versus "open standards". There was no resolution as to the clarification of "open source" versus "open standards" or a direct opinion from Matt on either issue. Matt then expressed his thanks to WEAT for their participation in this effort and left the meeting.

After Matt left a number of the WEAT members expressed the following concerns:

- How will projects that are currently 'in-flight' be addressed with regards to the Enterprise Architecture? Especially, as some of these projects have multi-year implications.

- How can something be created quickly to address current business needs? An example of the need and in-process projects regarding ERP (Enterprise Resource Planning) Systems that are being discussed by various entities within the extended enterprise of the State of Wisconsin. The key idea expressed was how can 'standard interface' requirements be quickly developed, so that the different ERP applications can share data.

Answers to these concerns was not addressed at the meeting. These concerns will be noted and included within a WEAT issues log for resolution.

[1] *A copy of the article is provided as an attachment to the meeting minutes.*

Overview of DET Enterprise Technology Inventory – Monique Currie

Monique Currie was invited to the WEAT meeting to discuss her role as the project leader for the Enterprise Asset Inventory. Monique told WEAT that she was basically presenting the same material she used for the TLC meeting on Friday 2-20-2004. Monique stated that the project is expected to be completed by the end of June 2004. In addition as part of the Server Consolidation effort, Crowe Chizek will be performing an asset inventory. Monique said that the information she has been gathering, as part of the enterprise asset inventory will be provided to Crowe Chizek.

Jay Jaeger raised the question of, "How and in what way can WEAT provide guidance in a timely manner to the efforts of Crowe Chizek and the server consolidation effort?" This question was not answered and will be noted as an issue to direct to the CIO for resolution.

Monique described the process she has been using to first gather the types of business questions the enterprise asset inventory is expected to answer. As part of her requirements gathering she has meet with Domain managers from the following domains: desktop, server, network, information privacy and security and IT management. As domain managers for the information management and application domains were not yet appointed during her requirements gathering phase, these domains have not yet been included into the requirements.

Jay expressed a concern expressed that the information and applications domains have not been included in Monique's initial requirements gathering process. Furthermore, Jay expressed concern that the information and application domains were of critical importance and should be include in the requirements gathering for the enterprise asset inventory. As the domain managers have been recently appointed, Monique and Michelle will work together to include requirements from these two domains in the enterprise asset inventory.

They have gathered over 400 "pieces of information" that folks have expressed interest in knowing about, in 14 broad areas. To get things in hand, they are proceeding under direction from the office of the CIO to prioritize these, with special emphasis on those that will be useful in making plans for FY05, PC procurement and server consolidation (and also avoiding overlap with the work the selected server consolidation RFP winner will be doing).

Draft Documents, Enterprise Architecture Principles and WEAT Charter – Ben Banks

Ben provided WEAT with several draft documents for their review and comment. These included:

- Conceptual Enterprise Life Cycle version 2.3 Document (Diagram);
- Wisconsin Enterprise Architecture Framework version 1.0 (Diagram);
- State of Wisconsin Enterprise Architecture Governance Model version 1.0 (Diagram);
- Wisconsin Enterprise Architecture Team Charter version 1.0 (Document); and
- Wisconsin Enterprise Architecture – Conceptual Architecture, Principles version 1.0 (Document).

Ben asked WEAT to review and comment on the Wisconsin Enterprise Architecture Team Charter and Wisconsin Enterprise Architecture – Conceptual Architecture, Principles documents for next week's team meeting.

Ben stated that a WEAT web site is in development and should be available within the next two weeks. While the WEAT site is in development, WEAT meeting minutes have been posted on the TLC web site at http://enterprise.state.wi.us/home/tlc/WEAT/home.htm.

Discussion of Zachman Framework – George Ross

Due to time constraints, the discussion of the Zachman Framework was postponed until the next WEAT meeting on 3-2-2004.

Enterprise Architecture, Phase One Conceptual Solution – Ben Banks

Ben outlined an example as to how something might enter into the Enterprise Architecture Life Cycle process flow. Here are Ben's initial comments regarding phase one, the development of a conceptual solution:

1. A business driver would be identified. The example used for discussion purposes was "we need a form of electronic communication".

2. WEAT, in consultation with subject matter experts (SME) would develop a conceptual solution. The example Ben used was that the SME's would refine the requirements for the business driver and based upon the requirements "email" would be the conceptual solution to the business driver of the need for a form of electronic communication.

3. Once WEAT had identified a conceptual solution, this would be forwarded to the TLC.

4. The TLC would assign the conceptual solution to a particular Domain or Working Group.

5. The Domains or Working Group would then evaluate various products, standards that would address the conceptual solution and would forward a product recommendation to WEAT for review / scoring.

6. WEAT would develop a score card for the conceptual solution and then use the score card to evaluate the Domain or Working Group recommended product solution.

7. If WEAT scores the Domain or Working Group production solution favorably then Phase 2 of the Enterprise Architecture Life Cycle is enacted. If WEAT does not favorably score the Domain or Working Group production solution then some other process would be implemented. This other process could be one of the following:
   A. It can go back to the TLC, where the Domain or Working Group can propose another solution product solution.
   B. An "Investment Decision" process would be used to determine the decision.
   C. CIO can exercise the ability to override a WEAT decision.

This discussion led into a high level discussion with respect to application architecture. Currently there is no vision of how infrastructure, applications and data fit together. There is definitely a

coupling between these three items and it is necessary to show the interdependencies between these items in terms of an Enterprise Architecture.

Process Mapping Phase One Conceptual Solution – Michelle Eldridge

Using Conceptual Enterprise Architecture Life Cycle Document version 2.3, Michelle engaged the members of WEAT in a discussion of how the process would work for phase one – conceptual architecture development[2]. The process Michelle used to facilitate the discussion included the identification of Objectives or Goals, Defining Inputs (Business Drivers), The Steps or Process to produce Outputs, Stakeholders and Defining Outputs. Based upon the discussion Michelle will prepare a roles and responsibility matrix for Phase One – Conceptual Solution Development[3].

EA Project: Phase I Objectives
- Balance agency and enterprise interests
- Constrain divergence of technology
- Develop process for deploying/using the architecture (governance piece)
- Develop principles
- Articulate an overall vision of applications, data, infrastructure
- Economic development

Objectives of developing a conceptual solution include:
- Assist with the recognition of a business need (driver).
- Begin the process of aligning technology within government, both from a horizontal (state agency to state agency) and vertical (Federal, State and Local).
- Avoid or minimize redundant efforts.
- Create and/ or assess a baseline of what exists, to that a 'to-be' environment.
- Obtain input from local units of Wisconsin government with respect to their IT objectives.

A business driver can come from:
- Strategic direction such as server consolidation.
- Technology Leadership Council directive.
- Business Leadership Council directive.
- Governor.
- Department of Administration Secretary.
- Chief Information Officer.
- Legislation – this could be from a variety of sources including: local, state, federal
- Industry direction.
- Societal or "Acts of God" (e.g. 9-11, Chronic Wasting Disease).
- Imputed from projects that come up

[2] *Note due to the confusion surrounding the term "conceptual architecture development" this was renamed to "conceptual solution development".*
[3] *Note the Phase One – Conceptual Solution Development Roles and Responsibility Matrix is provided as an attachment to the meeting minutes.*

- Business event
- Standards/directions from elsewhere

The development of a conceptual solution involves the following activities:

1. Obtain input of a business driver, this could originate from a variety of sources or stakeholders.
2. Identify and clarify the business problem (driver).
3. Clarify the requirements or needs regarding the business problem (driver) from the requester. *Note: this is different from developing "requirements" as part of the definition of a project's scope*.
4. Analytical work to determine options to solve the business problem, while meeting the business requirements as identified in the previous steps. The analytical work includes:
   - research what are best practices, industry trends and size of "solution space"
   - determine the scope, this includes "requirements gathering";
   - identify cost and scale of investment options are;
   - investigate if there opportunities for change, sharing or consolidation;
   - assess potential impacts upon existing business or IT processes;
   - investigate if there are other solutions in place elsewhere and what are any lessons learned; and
   - investigate if there is a range of technology alternatives.
5. Decide if business issue is an enterprise or agency specific.
6. Decide if a tactical solution is appropriate in the short term if you've identified a long term strategic problem.
7. Prioritize architecture solution efforts.
8. Synthesize needs for strategic decisions.
9. Recognize opportunities to become more closely aligned with principles.
10. Communicate with stakeholders.

Stakeholders for the conceptual solution development are:

- WEAT – Wisconsin Enterprise Architecture Team.
- Chief Information Officer.
- Business Leadership Council.
- Technology Leadership Council.
- Technology Domains.
- Agency or Agencies.
- DET Leadership.
- DET Operational Staff.
- Department of Administration Secretary.
- Governor.
- ITDC – Information Technology Director's Council.
- University of Wisconsin.
- County/Local Entities (e.g. GIPAW).
- Interagency Collaborative Groups.
- Federal Government.
- Program Area Business Partners.
- Solution/Technical Providers.

The output for the conceptual solution development is to provide a strategic recommendation for a conceptual solution that aligns IT with business need, provides a sound investment strategy and aligns with Enterprise Architecture.

Once the Roles and Responsibilities Matrix is developed, the next step is to develop a work flow diagram for Phase One.

Issues/Comments raised in the discussion but not addressed:

- Where do issues of application architecture fit in?
- Develop a vision of how infrastructure services and applications fit together
- Need to document the process for developing principles
- How will we quantify reducing redundancy?
  - Get and inventory of what currently exists?
  - Assess the baseline
- The scope of a business issue can shrink and grow
- Do we need to have a central clearinghouse/coordination point for activities? Who would be responsible for supporting that clearinghouse?
- Remind agencies and other to communicate with business partners (include this in any template that would be used to gather additional information on a business need)